

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Favorable reconsideration of this application, as presently amended and in light of the following discussion, is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-14 and 17-37 are pending, with Claims 1, 3, 4, 6-13, 17-20, 22, 24, and 25 amended, Claims 28-37 added and Claims 15-16 canceled by the present amendment.

In the Official Action, Claim 22 was objected to as including informalities; Claims 1, 2, 12, 22 and 23 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as anticipated by Misawa (U.S. Pat. No. 6,700,607); Claims 3, 4, 13 and 24-26 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as unpatentable over Misawa in view of Tanaka et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 6,130,420, herein “Tanaka”); Claims 5 and 6 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as unpatentable over Misawa in view of Tanaka in further view of Koide et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 6,870,556, herein “Koide”); Claims 8-10 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as unpatentable over Misawa in view of Uneo (U.S. Pat. Pub. No. 2001/0012072); Claims 14 and 27 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as unpatentable over Misawa in view of Tanaka in further view of Kijima et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 6,700,610, herein “Kijima”); Claims 7, 17 and 18 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as unpatentable over Misawa; and Claims 11 and 19-21 were objected to as dependent on a rejected base claim but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form.

Initially, Applicants acknowledge with appreciation the indication of allowable subject matter. However, since Applicants consider that amended Claims 1 and 17 patentably define over the cited references, Claims 11 and 19-21 have presently been maintained in dependent form.

With regard to the objection to Claim 22 as including informalities, Claim 22 has been amended to overcome the objection. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the objection to Claim 22 be withdrawn.

Addressing now the rejection of Claims 1, 2, 12, 22 and 23 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as anticipated by Misawa, Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

Claim 1 recites, in part,

an imaging device driven by a plurality of kinds of drive modes, the plurality of kinds of drive modes including a draft mode and a first frame mode;

an image display device having a number of pixels less than a number of pixels of the imaging device; and

an enlarging display setting device configured to enlarge a part of an area of a whole image obtained by the imaging device at a desired enlargement ratio and to display the part of the area being enlarged as an enlarged image on the image display device, wherein

the drive modes for driving the imaging device is changed to the first frame mode such that a resolution of the enlarged image is equal to or greater than a resolution of the image display device,

the first frame mode including dividing the overall pixels of the imaging device into three fields, and reading the three fields of the imaging device to obtain image data, the enlarged image being taken in from at least a portion of the image data.

Claims 22 and 28 recite similar features with regard to the first frame mode.

Misawa describes a camera in which images are refreshed at a high refresh rate in a normal image-capturing mode. However, Misawa does not describe or suggest the first frame mode including dividing the overall pixels of the imaging device into three fields, and reading the three fields of the imaging device to obtain image data, the enlarged image being taken in from at least a portion of the image data, as is recited in Claim 1.

The outstanding Action suggests on page 4 that “the applicants may want to focus further amendment on using three fields during a frame mode read as discussed on p.12 of Applicant’s specification.” Accordingly, Applicants have amended Claim 1 to recite that the first frame mode includes dividing the overall pixels of the imaging device into three fields and reading the three fields of the imaging device to obtain image data.

The outstanding Action acknowledges that the Misawa reference is being interpreted such that the claimed “frame mode” is equivalent to the state described in Misawa in which ½ of the pixels are read out. In addition, the outstanding Action asserts that Misawa describes a state in which all pixels are read out of the image sensor. However, it is not possible to interpret the Misawa reference as describing the first frame mode of Claim 1 which includes dividing the overall pixels of the imaging device into three fields and reading the three fields of the imaging device to obtain image data.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that Claim 1 and Claim 17 and claims depending therefrom patently distinguish over Misawa.

Moreover, none of the further cited Tanaka, Koide, Uneo or Kijima references cures the above noted deficiencies of Misawa with regard to the claimed invention. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that Claims 1 and 17 and claims depending therefrom, patentably distinguish over Misawa, Tanaka, Koide, Uneo or Kijima considered individually or in any combination.

Consequently, in light of the above discussion, the outstanding grounds for rejection are believed to have been overcome. The application as amended herewith is believed to be in condition for formal allowance. An early and favorable action to that effect is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

OBLON, SPIVAK, McCLELLAND,
MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C.

James J. Kulbaski
Attorney of Record
Registration No. 34,648

James Love
Registration No. 58,421

Customer Number

22850

Tel: (703) 413-3000
Fax: (703) 413 -2220
(OSMMN 08/07)